



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

TH

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/663,163	09/15/2003	Steven M. Bennett	42P15752	2836

7590 04/16/2007
Marina Portnova
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP
Seventh Floor
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90025

EXAMINER

WILSER, MICHAEL P

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2109

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	04/16/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

TH

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/663,163	Applicant(s) BENNETT ET AL.	
	Examiner Michael Wilser	Art Unit 2109	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 September 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-58 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-58 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 15 September 2003 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12/13/04 & 7/5/05</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the original filing of September 15, 2003. Claims 1-58 are pending and have been considered below.

Drawings

2. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference character(s) not mentioned in the description: 700 in Figure 7A, 700 in Figure 7B, 800 in Figure 8A, 800 in Figure 8B, and 1004 in Figure 10.
3. The drawings are objected to because both Figure 7A and 7B have the same reference character 700. Since reference character 700 is not discussed in the specification and the two figures are different it appears that the applicant has used reference character 700 to represent two different features.
4. The drawings are objected to because both Figure 8A and 8B have the same reference character 800. Since reference character 800 is not discussed in the specification and the two figures are different it appears that the applicant has used reference character 800 to represent two different features.
5. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure

number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

6. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: the examiner notes the use of acronyms (e.g. I/O, CR0 PG, etc.) throughout the specification without first including a description in plain text, as required.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

7. Claim 28 is objected to because of the following informalities: On page 41, line 5 the claim reads "VM state information state information". The examiner is interpreting this as having meant to be "VM state information" and that the second use of state information was a typo. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

8. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

9. Claims 57 and 58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

10. Claim 57 recites the limitation "machine-readable medium" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Claim 57 is dependent upon Claim 53, which is a system, not a machine-readable medium. For purpose of examination the examiner is interpreting Claim 57 as being dependent on Claim 56, which is aimed at a machine-readable medium.

11. Claim 58 recites the limitation "machine-readable medium" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Claim 58 is dependent upon Claim 53, which is a system, not a machine-readable medium. For purpose of examination the examiner is interpreting Claim 57 as being dependent on Claim 56, which is aimed at a machine-readable medium.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

12. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Art Unit: 2109

Claims 56-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 56-58 are drawn to a machine-readable medium, which the applicant has defined in the specification (page 7, lines 18-20) to encompass one of an electrical, optical, acoustical, or propagated transmission signals. The Office considers propagated signals to be a form of energy. Energy is not a series of steps or acts and this is not a process. Energy is not a physical article or object and as such is not a machine or manufacture. Energy is not a combination of substances and therefore not a compilation of matter. Thus, a propagated transmission signal does not fall within any of the four categories of invention. Therefore, Claims 56-58 are not statutory.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

13. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

14. Claims 1-8, 30-34, and 50-52 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by van der Made (US 7,093,239).

Art Unit: 2109

Claims 1, 30 and 50: van der Made discloses a method, apparatus, and system comprising:

- a. memory (column 6, lines 63-67 & column 7, lines 1-13);
- b. processor coupled to memory (column 6, lines 63-67 & column 7, lines 1-13);
- c. processor-managed resources coupled to the processor (column 6, lines 63-67 & column 7, lines 1-13);
- d. identifying a predefined behavior of a virtual machine monitor (VMM) with respect to a virtual machine (VM) (column 5, lines 40-57); and
- e. utilizing processor-managed resources associated with the VM based on the predefined behavior of the VMM (column 6, lines 58-61).

Claims 2, 31, and 51: van der Made discloses a method, apparatus, and system as in Claims 1, 30, and 50 above, and further discloses that the predefined behavior of the VMM is one of a first-time invocation, subsequent invocation, last invocation, or a modification of content (column 5, lines 40-57).

Claims 3, 32, and 52: van der Made discloses a method, apparatus, and system as in Claims 1, 30, and 50 above, and further discloses that identifying the predefined behavior comprises receiving an indication of the predefined behavior (column 5, lines 40-57).

Art Unit: 2109

Claim 4: van der Made discloses a method as in Claim 3 above, and further discloses that the indication is received via an executed instruction (column 8, lines 37-57).

Claim 5: van der Made discloses a method as in Claim 4 above, and further discloses that the executed instruction is one of a launch instruction, resume instruction, an access instruction, or a clear instruction (column 8, lines 37-57).

Claim: 6 and 33: van der Made discloses a method and apparatus as in Claims 1 and 30 above, and further discloses that identifying the predefined behavior comprises determining behavior through logic within a processor (column 5, lines 40-57).

Claim 7: van der Made discloses a method as in Claim 6 above and further discloses that the logic within the processor is prediction logic (column 9, lines 48-59).

Claims 8 and 34: van der Made discloses a method and apparatus as in Claims 1 and 30 above, and further discloses that the processor-managed resource is one of allocation, de-allocation, verification of data, or loading of data (column 6, lines 58-66).

15. Claims 9-11, 19-21, 35-36, 41-42, 53-55, and 56-58 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ogi (US 5,361,375).

Art Unit: 2109

Claims 9, 35, and 56: Ogi discloses of a method, apparatus, and machine-readable medium comprising:

- a. determining that a transition from a virtual machine monitor (VMM) to a virtual machine (VM) is about to occur (column 3, lines 56-67 & column 4, lines 1-6);
 - b. determining the type of transition (column 3, lines 56-67 & column 4, lines 1-6);
- and
- c. notifying a processor of the type of transition (column 4, lines 7-18).

Claims 10, 36, and 57: Ogi discloses a method, apparatus, and medium as in Claims 9, 35, and 56 above, and further discloses of executing an instruction associated with the type of transition (column 4, lines 7-18).

Claims 19, 41, and 53: Ogi discloses of a method, apparatus, and system comprising:

- a. memory to store guest information (column 1, lines 11-18);
 - b. processor coupled to memory (column 1, lines 11-18);
 - c. receiving from a virtual machine monitor (VMM) a request to perform a transition from the VMM to a virtual machine (VM) (column 3, lines 56-67 & column 4, lines 1-6);
 - d. indicating a type of transition (column 3, lines 56-67 & column 4, lines 1-6);
- and
- e. performing a set f operations according to the type of transition (column 4, lines 7-18).

Claims 20, 42, and 54: Ogi discloses a method, apparatus, and system as in Claims 19, 41, and 53 above, and further discloses identifying a VMM executing an instruction associated with the type of transition (column 4, lines 7-18).

Claims 11, 21, 55, and 58: Ogi discloses of a method, system, and medium as in Claims 9, 19, 53, and 56 above, and further discloses that the transition is one of an initial transfer or subsequent transfer to the VM (column 6, lines 49-60).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

16. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

17. Claims 12-16, 18, 22-23, 37-40, and 43-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogi (US 5,361,375) in view of Shultz (US 4,916,608).

Claim 12: Ogi discloses a method as in Claim 11 above, but does not explicitly disclose that in response to an initial transfer to allocate a memory region for the new virtual machine controller and activating the new controller. However, Shultz discloses a similar method in which in response to an initial transfer (column 1, lines 48-52) memory is allocated to the region for a new controller (column 1, lines 33-47) and requesting the

Art Unit: 2109

controller to be activated (column 1, lines 48-52). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to allocate memory to the region and request activation of the controller in Ogi. One would have been motivated to allocate memory and activate control since there is no control structure in place since it is the initial request for a VM from the system and therefore a control structure would have to be initiated.

Claim 37: Ogi discloses an apparatus as in Claim 35 above, but does not explicitly disclose that in response to an initial transfer to allocate a memory region for the new virtual machine controller and activating the new controller or requesting the processor to set execution control information and state information. However, Shultz discloses a similar method in which in response to an initial transfer (column 1, lines 48-52) memory is allocated to the region for a new controller (column 1, lines 33-47) and requesting the controller to be activated (column 1, lines 48-52). Shultz also discloses that the requesting processor sets the control and state information (column 5, lines 8-17 & column 6, lines 58-66). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention allocate memory to the region and request activation of the controller in Ogi along with requesting the processor to set control and state information. One would have been motivated to allocate memory and activate control since there is no control structure in place since it is the initial request for a VM from the system and therefore a control structure would have to be initiated. One would

Art Unit: 2109

have also been motivated to set the control and state information so that the apparatus would have the information needed to begin running the VM for the current guest.

Claims 13 and 38: Ogi and Shultz disclose of a method and apparatus as in Claims 12 and 37 above, and Shultz further discloses of a load instruction pointer as an operand (column 9, lines 33-60). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have a load instruction pointer as an operand in Ogi. One would have been motivated to have a load instruction pointer as an operand so that the system running the virtual machine can keep track of where the control structure resides in memory.

Claim 14: Ogi and Shultz disclose of a method as in Claim 12 above, and Shultz further discloses that the processor requests initialization of the control structure (column 1, lines 48-52). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have the processor in Ogi request initialization of the control structure. One would have been motivated to request initialization of the control structure so that once a VM had been created for the guest the VM could be controlled by the hosting system.

Claims 15 and 39: Ogi and Shultz disclose of a method and apparatus as in Claims 12 and 37 above, and Shultz further discloses of executing a clear instruction including the pointer to the new control structure as an operand (column 9, lines 33-60). Therefore, it

Art Unit: 2109

would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have a clear instruction with a pointer as an operand in Ogi. One would have been motivated to have a clear instruction with a pointer to the control structure so that when the control structure is cleared the pointer is properly queued and in sync with the rest of the VM.

Claim 16: Ogi and Shultz disclose a method as in Claim 12 above, and Shultz further discloses requesting the processor to activate the control structure includes setting control and state information (column 5, lines 8-17 & column 6, lines 58-66). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to set control and state information upon activation of the control structure in Ogi. One would have been motivated to set the control and state information when the control structure was activated so that the control structure would know the current condition and activity of the VM that it is controlling.

Claims 18 and 40: Ogi discloses a method and apparatus as in Claims 11 and 35 above, but does not explicitly disclose that upon a subsequent transfer that the requesting processor updates the control structure. However, Shultz disclose a similar method and apparatus that upon a subsequent transfer request (column 1, lines 33-47) the processor updates the content of the control structure (column 1, lines 33-47). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to update the control structure in Ogi in response to a subsequent transfer.

Art Unit: 2109

One would have been motivated to update the control structure so that upon the subsequent transfer request the control structure is able to handle the requests of the new VM which has now been put under its control.

Claims 22 and 43: Ogi discloses a method and apparatus as in Claims 19 and 41 above, but does not explicitly disclose that prior to receiving a request to perform a transition that a pointer is generated for the control structure of the VM from the VMM. However, Shultz discloses a similar method and apparatus where a pointer from the VMM to the control structure is generated upon a transition request (column 9, lines 33-60). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to generate a pointer to the new control structure upon transition in Ogi. One would have been motivated to create a pointer from the VMM to the control structure associated with the VM so that if another control structure is created the VMM can keep track of the current location and status of the control structures.

Claims 23 and 44: Ogi and Shultz disclose of a method and apparatus as in Claims 22 and 43 above, and Shultz further discloses that a pointer to the control structure is included as an operand of a load instruction (column 9, lines 33-60). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have the control structure pointer include an operand to the load instruction in Ogi. One would have been motivated to include an operand load instruction so that the pointer corresponds to the correct position in memory when a control structure loads.

18. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogi (US 5,361,375) and Shultz (US 4,916,608) as applied to claim 16 above, and further in view of Yoshida (US 5,408,617).

Claim 17: Ogi and Shultz disclose a method as in Claim 16 above, but do not explicitly disclose that setting control and state information comprises executing a control structure write instruction identifying a component to which data is to be written.

However, Yoshida discloses a similar method that executes a write instruction having an operand that identifies a component to which data is to be written (column 4, lines 61-67 & column 5, lines 1-7). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have identified the component to which data is to be written in Ogi. One would have been motivated to identify the component to be written to so that the control structure could process the write requests from the virtual machine.

19. Claims 24-29 and 45-49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogi (US 5,361,375) and Shultz (US 4,916,608) as applied to claims 22 and 41 above, and further in view of Brelsford et al. (US 5,230,069).

Claim 24: Ogi and Shultz disclose a method as in Claim 22 above, and Shultz further disclose that the type of transition is an initial transition to a virtual machine (column 1,

Art Unit: 2109

lines 48-52). However, Shultz does not explicitly disclose marking the control structure as cleared, determining that the control structure is cleared, and performing validation checks on state information. However, Brelsford discloses a similar method in which the control system is marked as cleared (column 3, lines 23-32), determining that the control structure is cleared (column 1, lines 64-68 and column 2, lines 1-7), and performing validation checks on state information (column 1, lines 64-68, & column 2, lines 1-7 & 25-44). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to mark and determine that the control structure is clear in Ogi along with validating the state information. One would have been motivated to mark and determine the control structure is clear and validate the current state information so that the new control structure is prepared to handle the new requests of the VM.

Claim 25: Ogi Shultz, and Brelsford disclose a method as in Claim 24 above, and Shultz further discloses of executing a clear instruction including the pointer to the new control structure as an operand (column 9, lines 33-60). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have a clear instruction with a pointer as an operand in Ogi. One would have been motivated to have a clear instruction with a pointer to the control structure so that when the control structure is cleared the pointer is properly queued and in sink with the rest of the VM.

Art Unit: 2109

Claim 26: Ogi and Shultz disclose a method as in Claim 22 above, but do not explicitly disclose of allocating on-processor cache storage for the control structure and cache storage during operation. However, Brelsford discloses a similar method in which on-processor cache storage is performed (column 1, lines 64-68 & column 2, lines 1-7 & 25-44). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have allocated on-processor caching in Ogi. One would have been motivated to use on-processor caching so that as the control structure performs its duties it can pull in and send out information to accomplish the tasks of the VM.

Claim 27: Ogi and Shultz disclose a method as in Claim 22 above, and Shultz further discloses that the transfer is a subsequent transfer (column 1, lines 33-47). However, Shultz does not explicitly disclose that a plurality of validation checks is performed on the state information. However, Brelsford discloses a similar method in which a plurality of validation checks is performed on the state information (column 1, lines 64-68 & column 2, lines 1-7 & 25-44). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to perform a plurality of validation checks of state information in Ogi. One would have been motivated to perform a plurality of state information checks so that the state of information within the control structure is known and therefore whether the structure is ready to be cleared or not.

Claim 28: Ogi, Shultz and Brelsford disclose a method as in Claim 27 above, and Brelsford further discloses of determining whether state information in the on-processor

Art Unit: 2109

cache has been modified (column 1, lines 64-68, & column 2 lines 1-7 & 25-44) and validating the state information element if it has been modified (column 1, lines 64-68, & column 2 lines 1-7 & 25-44). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to determine whether the state information had been modified and to validate the modified information in Ogi. One would have been motivated to determine whether there was a modification and verify the information so that the correct state information is contained within the virtual machine.

Claim 29: Ogi, Shultz and Brelsford disclose a method as in Claim 27 above, and Brelsford further discloses of determining whether state information is contained in the on-processor cache (column 1, lines 64-68, & column 2 lines 1-7 & 25-44) and validating the state information element if it has been modified (column 1, lines 64-68, & column 2 lines 1-7 & 25-44). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to determine whether the state information is contained and to validate the modified information in Ogi. One would have been motivated to determine whether the information was contained and verify the information so that the correct state information is contained within the virtual machine.

Claim 45: Ogi discloses an apparatus as in Claim 41 above, but does not explicitly disclose that the response is a response to an initial transfer. However, Shultz discloses a similar apparatus that the type of transition is an initial transition to a virtual machine

Art Unit: 2109

(column 1, lines 48-52). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have the transition be an initial transition in Ogi. One would have been motivated to have the transition be an initial transition since upon the first request for a virtual machine a control structure would be needed to control the features of the machine.

However, Ogi and Shultz do not explicitly disclose determining that the control structure is cleared, and performing validation checks on state information. However, Brelsford discloses a similar apparatus that determines that the control structure is cleared (column 1, lines 64-68 and column 2, lines 1-7), and performing validation checks on state information (column 1, lines 64-68, & column 2, lines 1-7 & 25-44). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to determine that the control structure is clear in Ogi along with validating the state information. One would have been motivated to determine the control structure is clear and validate the current state information so that the new control structure is prepared to handle the new requests of the VM.

Claim 46: Ogi, Shultz, and Brelsford disclose of an apparatus as in Claim 45 above, and Brelsford further discloses that on-processor cache storage is performed (column 1, lines 64-68 & column 2, lines 1-7 & 25-44). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have allocated on-processor caching in Ogi. One would have been motivated to use on-processor caching

Art Unit: 2109

so that as the control structure performs its duties it can pull in and send out information to accomplish the tasks of the VM.

Claim 47: Ogi, Shultz and Brelsford disclose of an apparatus as in Claim 45 above, and Brelsford further discloses performing a plurality of validation checks on the state information (column 1, lines 64-68 & column 2, lines 1-7 & 25-44). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to perform a plurality of validation checks of state information in Ogi. One would have been motivated to perform a plurality of state information checks so that the state of information within the control structure is known and therefore whether the structure is ready to be cleared or not.

Claim 48: Ogi, Shultz and Brelsford disclose of an apparatus as in Claim 47 above, and Brelsford further discloses of determining whether state information in the on-processor cache has been modified (column 1, lines 64-68, & column 2 lines 1-7 & 25-44) and validating the state information element if it has been modified (column 1, lines 64-68, & column 2 lines 1-7 & 25-44). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to determine whether the state information had been modified and to validate the modified information in Ogi. One would have been motivated to determine whether there was a modification and verify the information so that the correct state information is contained within the virtual machine.

Claim 49: Ogi, Shultz and Brelsford disclose of an apparatus as in Claim 48 above, and Brelsford further discloses of determining whether state information is contained in the on-processor cache (column 1, lines 64-68, & column 2 lines 1-7 & 25-44) and validating the state information element if it has been modified (column 1, lines 64-68, & column 2 lines 1-7 & 25-44). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to determine whether the state information is contained and to validate the modified information in Ogi. One would have been motivated to determine whether the information was contained and verify the information so that the correct state information is contained within the virtual machine.


Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Wilser whose telephone number is (571) 270-1689. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 7:30-5:00 EST (Alt Fridays Off).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James Myhre can be reached on (571) 270-1065. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2109

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


MPW
April 4, 2007


James Myhre
Supervisory Patent Examiner